

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
7

8 BGC PARTNERS INC., *et al.*,
9 Plaintiffs,

10 vs.

11 AVISON YOUNG, INC., *et al.*,
12 Defendants.
13

Case No. 2:15-cv-00531-RFB-GWF

ORDER

14 This matter is before the Court on the parties' Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No.
15 87), filed on June 23, 2017.

16 Discovery plans requesting longer than 180 days from the date the first defendant answers or
17 appears require special scheduling review. LR 26-1(a) is explicit:

18 If longer deadlines are proposed, the plan must state on its face
19 "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." Plans requesting
20 special scheduling review must include, in addition to the information
required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(b), a statement of the
reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case ...

21 The parties' discovery plan requests a 488-day discovery period but does not give an adequate
22 explanation for the longer period as required by LR 26-1(a). Accordingly,

23 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the parties' Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF
24 No. 87) is **denied** without prejudice.

25 DATED this 7th day of July, 2017.
26

27 
28 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
United States Magistrate Judge